



ALANTHA O
ABEY QUIDDITCH
PHOTOGRAPHY O

Photo: Alantha Abey Quidditch Photography



**QUIDDITCH
AUSTRALIA**

Quidditch Australia's Board Meeting Minutes May



Quidditch Australia's Board Meeting

Minutes May

Date: 25. 05. 2020

Location: Google Hangouts

Present: Ajantha Abey, Kelsey Collins, Alistair Yap, Jamie Turbet, Nicola Gertler, Luke Derrick, Scott Palmer

Meeting Opened: 8:04pm

Luke Derrick gives the chair to Jamie Turbet at 8:05

Dropbears

JT: Most teams were pro option 2, but many teams didn't submit a response

LD: Lots of teams had disagreements within the team so they didn't send responses.

JT: Should we discuss each option?

NG: Every team but one wanted option 3. People don't think option 1 is bad. The reason that they're not going for option 1 is to consider that the current group of players has put some kind of effort. What stands out they want to acknowledge is that the current players have contributed and did not have time to reselect, but we do if we follow the last time line. They still want opportunity for people to be involved whilst acknowledging the current team.

Financial concerns come through often.

JT: entire reselection vs training together?

AJ: Yes. I dont think the dichotomy choosing best team vs current players is not completely against. Assumption that the first option gives us the best team isn't necessarily true.



LD: It is important to note that their belief wasn't that option 1 wouldn't give them a better team either because there is the idea that some might have dropped off in skill but that will be the same as everyone, so there wouldn't be more people having a chance regardless.

NG: What do you mean by that?

LD: This idea that if we redid the team it will be very different might not be true in reality. No one will have played in 5 months and so an entire drop in skill, trials would be a worse quality than last time, so it'll be hard, unless you

NG: I think that the argument that a second lot of try outs would just give you the same or worse result because people haven't been training, potentially demonstrates complacency. Try outs should be structured. People not needing to prove themselves will make people complacent.

KC: We also need to consider how option 1 includes the entire community, it does that without bias

AY: If we wanted to do option 1 or 2 we could reinvite everyone who applied last time.

KC: You would need to extend invites beyond that

AY: As a start we could invite others along

KC: Just for clarification, how are we deciding this?

LD: You can decide tonight, or to team reps, up to you.

AJ: 2 big arguments for option one is that next wc is 2024, want to give others the opportunity, but we can give other opportunities later one, it is qually crap for those who have already made the team and put the investment in. Things will have changed over time, but I don't think things will have changed too drastically due to situation, this would only apply to players who were there but could not go to 2020 for whatever reason. More benefit developing who we have rather than reselecting everyone - emotional and financial labour. Reselection involves huge effort, also takes lots of admin effort which we don't want to have burnout. Too much stress and energy.

NG: We don't know what other dropbear opportunities they will be - and they won't be the same as WC. Point about Ruth and Paul is valid, but sometimes we have to push through as a volunteer, it sucks but that's how it is sometimes. We are trying to make the fairest decision possible

AJ: Just want to clarify I'm not opposed to small reselection

LD: Assuming complacency isn't fair on the team, I don't think they would do that



AJ: Everyone was very keen on making sure the current team is accountable

NG: On the accountability thing, we don't currently have a policy on movement on anything other than injury.

AJ: Yes we should have accountability but without the competitive aspect

JT: Yes, and that would be true of any position

LD: Please have an end date, rather than constantly holding it over their head

JT: That's a good point

NG: Regarding Pauls suggestion, We have already put a hierarchy, so we if we maintain 21 we should also maintain the next 4. I don't understand the suggestion.

LD: We prefer it to be a thirty group with an invite to people who. Not sure what Paul means.

NG: If we have any sort of try-outs and end up with the exact same team, that's not a waste of time, they have still proven their spot. If the training camps are structured more like training camps, you are still spending your time training together. If you're on the team you shouldn't be complacent you should still be working very hard.

AJ: I just would like to say a training is still different to a try out.

NG: I understand what you mean, but how you run something comes down to management, people are always competitive anyway. Try-outs were very independent, whereas the training weekends were very focussed on strategy and bringing it together

LD: We don't have the authority to determine the structure of trainings and try-outs

JT: We need to keep the discussion moving so I'm going to have to wrap this up now. Luke & Nicola if you could leave the rest of us will discuss.

NG: Just before I go, someone said we should consult the current team - hasn't been discussed

Nicola Gertler and Luke Derrick Left 8:47

AJ: We haven't consulted the team as the team, but players have been able to voice their opinion through their own team.



JT: It would also invites bias

AJ: My first question is are we happy making a final decision?

JT: Timeline is my only concern, we don't really know what is viable as we don't know when things will start up again.

KC: We need to decide max 3 options and then get more feedback as everything is dependent

AJ: I agree that we shouldn't make a final decision and would like to think about everything further

SP: Same as everyone else, if we are engaging the community as much as possible that is good

AY: Same page although if we're asking for feedback we should try harder to engage with them

AJ: I did, not sure how much more we could do

JT - get options sorted, release them and get feedback further down the track

AJ - need feedback on players that are 100% committed. Synergy is the concern with retention of players. Resuming full contact sport is uncertain (time line) which affects the decisions with reselection

JT - motion to decide on options, option 1?

KC is not against - everyone else is against

JT- team doesn't disappear but the extras are added in as a larger squad

Everyone agrees it's an option

AJ - hierarchy of the current team members, extras added into the training squad (lowest hierarchy) then move up if they display better qualities and higher ups l/synergy/interest

AY - agree with AJ



AY- 21 + 4 are committed and us allowing them to stay shows our commitment to them

AJ - manticores feedback - asking selectors for their opinion - need to consider the fact that selectors are all on the team and we need to consider getting nonplayer selectors and coaches involved

JT: Should we continue to include Nicola and Luke?

SP - NG and LD have exhausted their feedback

KC - we can release the options that we decided on to slack and allow NG and LD to comment

AY - they should give their feedback as part of the dropbear team

JT - We need to decide if we ask Dropbears for feedback

JT/AY -agree that LD and NG have given all their feedback required

KC - clarification on which options we were looking at

AJ - add people in (a) as a completely mixed bag (no structure) (b) as part of the training squad subject to the hierarchy (21 + 4 held to high standard and if they drop off, the training squad members are moved up). In both scenarios it's up to the selectors and coaching staff (current and new) to make the final selection decisions.

JT - reminder to do my own job and keep team up to date

NG/LD rejoin meeting. At 9:10

JT - We haven't made a decision. We will update you on the options we decided on.

AJ - put out a call for new selectors (to get non playing selectors if possible), but retain the current team as well

Jamie Turbet gives Chair to Luke Derrick – 9:12



Membership System

JT: I forgot to mention last time, something I am really sorry about, is that the gender field is an issue. It only asks for male/female, and we don't have the option to change it, and it is mandatory question. They suggested we add an extra field with other options, but people would still need to answer the first one. They recommended to look at if like asking for their assigned sex at birth. I took that to gender engagement and they said no go. The gender field will be updated later in the year in Q4.

LD: Start next year, gender is huge, especially for us. If it is changed at Q4 that is after the QUAFL deadline so we probably won't have any sign-ups so that is a waste of money.

JT: We should note migration is a possibility with an extra cost.

NG: Agreed

Communication

JT: Our trial is over how does everyone feel with internal communication?

LD: Slack is good, continue to move across to it.

AJ: Slack for all internal communication, email for all external

JT: I would prefer emails for documents as I find things get lost easily in slack.

AJ: There are ways to look up documents

NG: Links to documents are good

AJ: There's a lot of functionality on slack that we don't use.

JT: I would like to also say we need to be clearer with each other about our opinions, and always explaining our stance. I think this will lead to better decision making, and will ensure we can justify our decisions to our members. We also need to be discussing things with each other outside of meetings, otherwise it will take us too long to do things and make meetings drag on.

JT: In regard to club and state communication almost all prefer emails, so I think we should make more progress to less and less Facebook. I wouldn't say that right now as we should stay consistent due to the lack of uncertainty and constant changes lately.

LD: Yes slow



KC: There is value in updates on facebook

LD: Agreed, once per week facebook, then once monthly, and then weekly email and onwards

JT: Just to clarify this is private facebook communication, not public

AJ: I like the national cabinet thing - you can also create common channel with all the slacks, assuming states and clubs have slack.

State Shield

AJ: Do we ask the community for feedback?

AY: There are lots of conflicts

JT: I asked the states, only QNSW responded I think

NG: Vic can start later, current QA deadline - vic fantasy

AY: With QLD wanting to be a step behind, will they have

NG: Run something big like state, welcome back thing, otherwise poll

QUAFL

AY: Storage is the only issue.

NG: Line markings?

AY: I'll check line markings. \$252 per field. Not sure what field.

NG: Probably a quidditch field. Make sure people book early. If there is a big event on the GC we should look for SC

AY: Fields are closer this year in SC and for a good price

JT: Do we have any cancellation fees?

AY: I'll double check

AJ: Just a side note, we should still be cautious about spending money



Complaint Structure

AJ: We don't have anything internal. I would like to.

JT: I am very cautious about this has any structure that has limitations would lead to the mishandling of a complaint. I agree we should appoint officers.

AJ: I mean more we need to develop a protocol for how to complain

SP: HR can do this

KC: QNSW is doing a grievance policy, we could jump on board that.

JT: We already have one. We don't need to do this

LD: I think everything should think about this and come back to it next meeting.

Staff Structure

AJ: There is a document in slack, everyone should read this and give their thoughts.

COVID

AJ: NSW can move forward and SA - unsure about elsewhere

Meeting Closed: 9:48pm